IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Honorable Commissioner for Patents U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

The Applicants are in receipt of the Office Action mailed February 20, 2009, largely in the nature of a restriction requirement on the basis of purported lack of unity of invention. Applicants reply below.

First, however, acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

Restriction has been required among what the PTO deems as being three separate inventions which are said to Appln. No. 10/591,058 Reply dated March 20, 2009 Reply to Office Action of February 20, 2009

lack unity of invention. As applicants must make an election even though the requirement is traversed, applicants hereby respectfully and provisionally elect Group I, presently claims 1-6 and 13-16, with traverse and without prejudice.

Applicants submit that there is no lack of unity of invention between Group I and Group II, but only a difference in scope, and the subject matter shared by claims 1 and 7 goes beyond anything disclosed or made obvious by JP '119. As regards Group III, these claims call for the apparatus for carrying out the method of Groups I and II, and again the shared subject matter is not anticipated or made obvious by the prior art, insofar as is known. Accordingly, the claims meet the requirements for unity of invention of PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2.

Therefore, the requirement should be with withdrawn and all the claims examined on the merits, and such are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys, for Applicants

Ву /

Sheridan Neimark' Registration No. 20,520

1 MMas

SN:jnj

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528 G:\bn\o\ohta\fujii10\pto\2009-03-20RestricResp.doc